DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 384 386 JC 950 346

AUTHOR Horne, Peter
TITLE One-Person Criminal Justice Programs: An Exploratory Study.
INSTITUTION Princeton Univ., NJ. Mid-Career Fellowship Program.
PUB DATE May 95
NOTE 26p.; In its: Issues of Education at Community Colleges: Essays by Fellows in the Mid-Career Fellowship Program at Princeton University; see JC 950 341.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adjunct Faculty; Community Colleges; *Criminology; *Department Heads; Full Time Faculty; Law Related Education; *Police Education; *Program Improvement; State Surveys; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Responsibility; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *One Person Departments (College)

ABSTRACT

Criminal justice programs at community colleges have often been used to subsidize other programs and often have only one full-time faculty member. To examine issues confronting programs with only one full-time faculty member, surveys were conducted of faculty in one-person programs at 11 community colleges in New Jersey. Completed questionnaires were received by faculty at 10 of the 11 programs, while 5 respondents were also interviewed by phone. A professor at the state's only four-year college with a one-person department also completed a questionnaire. Study results included the following: (1) advantages of a one-person department cited by respondents included ease of scheduling and textbook selection, more leeway in curriculum development, having the power to hire adjuncts, and more autonomy; (2) disadvantages cited by respondents were more numerous and strident and included excessive workload, excessive student advisement, lack of peer interaction, student intellectual stagnation from lack of varied viewpoints, having sole responsibility for programs, and inadequate reimbursement for administrative duties; and (3) key issues identified as confronting respondents' programs included early career burnout from too many responsibilities, problems associated with teaching off-campus courses and monitoring students during field internships, lack of peer interaction, and excessive utilization of adjuncts. (The survey instrument is appended.) Contains nine references. (KP)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED 384 386

# ONE-PERSON CRIMINAL JUSTICE PROGRAMS: AN EXPLORATORY STUDY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

T. Rabb

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

by

Peter Horne, PhD
Professor and Coordinator
Criminal Justice Program
Mercer County Community College
Trenton, New Jersey 08690

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
History 520
Princeton University, New Jersey
May 1995

JC 950 3416 VP



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This paper will examine the issues which confront one-person criminal justice programs in American community colleges. Clearly there are both advantages and disadvantages to these kinds of programs run by only one full-time faculty member. Identification, classification and analysis of the myriad issues challenging professors running such programs will be the central focus of this exploratory study. In those community colleges nationwide with criminal justice programs (416) about 43% (179) of the criminal justice programs are staffed by one full-time educator (Nemeth 1991). Some criminal justice programs at four-year colleges and universities are also staffed this way. And even though this paper focuses on the discipline of criminal justice, many of the points raised and key issues will apply to one-person programs in virtually any discipline.

In 1984 the national Joint Commission on Criminology and Criminal Justice Education and Standards wrote that "For too long and in too many institutions of higher education, criminal justice, with its large student enrollments, has been subject to exploitation. The use of criminal justice education to subsidize other academic and administrative programs has severely hampered the field's development" (Ward and Webb 1984:11). It has been a dozen years since that statement was written, and one could make a credible argument that in a number of ways criminal justice education today is "healthier" now than it has ever been. But some colleges still view criminal justice programs as "cash cows," so the exploitation of criminal justice education noted in the past continues in a number of schools.

There is an obvious exploitation of the criminal justice discipline and its students in the colleges that staff their programs only with part-time adjunct professors. Both the students and the discipline as a whole are short-changed by this arrangement. One source indicates that about 4.5% of the criminal justice programs at community colleges are staffed only by part-time faculty (Nemeth 1991). Diminution of quality can also occur even in criminal justice programs where there is a full-time faculty member when the one criminal justice professor is overwhelmed by his or her workload, and there is an excessive use of adjuncts. The primary purpose of this study is to point out to criminal justice faculty and college administrators that one-person programs are fragile entities needing constant monitoring to ensure that the intrinsic negative points of such staffing arrangements don't outweigh the positive points and thereby adversely affect criminal justice education.

## Literature Review

An extensive computer search of the Educational Resources information Center (ERIC) found no literature specifically on one-person programs in higher education in criminal justice or other disciplines. Contact with personnel at the ERIC Clearinghouse for Higher Education also confirmed that this is an unstudied area. A good deal of material has been written about part-time (adjunct) faculty, but nothing has been solely devoted to this issue of one-person programs. The Invisible Faculty (Guppa and Leslie 1993) is a good study of the status of part-timers in higher education.

The literature on criminal justice education was also examined to see if that would shed some light on this subject if only in a peripheral way. Surprisingly, there

again, there was no mention of this not uncommon staffing pattern of one-person criminal justice programs. Since most (but not all) of these programs are at the two-year colleges, Guidelines for Criminal Justice Programs in Community and Junior Colleges (Hoover and Lund 1977) was examined. This document was published in conjunction with the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, and while issues such as the utilization of adjuncts were addressed, no mention was made of one-person programs. This was also true of the other literature pertaining to criminal justice higher education. The Accreditation Guidelines for Postsecondary Criminal Justice Education Programs (Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences [ACJS] Accreditation and Standards Committee 1976) are national guidelines developed for the criminal justice discipline at colleges and universities. The ACJS, which developed these guidelines, is one of the two primary professional organizations (the American Society of Criminology (ASC) being the other) for criminal justice and criminology professors of two-year, four-year and graduate programs.

Four major, comprehensive reports are devoted to criminal justice higher education. The Quality of Police Education (Sherman and the National Advisory Commission on Higher Education for Police Officers [NACHEPO] 1978) was sponsored by the Police Foundation (a nonprofit think-tank in Washington, D.C.). This book presents the findings of a national commission of noted educators, police administrators and public officials who conducted a two-year inquiry into the problems and issues of police education. Another book was written to correct some of the perceived shortcomings of the Commission's report. Criminal Justice Education: The End of the Beginning (Pearson et al. 1980) was the result of five years of research and work at

John Jay College of Criminal Justice in New York City. Quest for Quality (Ward and Webb 1984) was the result of a five-year study to determine minimum standards for higher education in criminology and criminal justice. The research and this report were completed by the Joint Commission on Criminology and Criminal Justice Education Standards, a group of leading educators who are members of the ACJS and/or ASC. The Police Executive Research Forum (PERF) sponsored the most recent report, The State of Police Education: Policy Direction for the 21st Century (Carter, Sapp, and Stephens 1989). This research is really geared to providing police chiefs, elected officials and city administrators (rather than educators) with knowledge regarding the development of policies that encourage, reward and require higher education for police officers.

Anderson's Directory of Criminal Justice Education -1991 (Nemeth 1991) is the most recent and comprehensive listing of two and four-year criminal justice programs in the country. It also gives some indication of the extent of one-person programs. Lastly, an invaluable piece of research for this paper was New Jersey's version of Anderson's Directory entitled Directory of Criminal Justice Programs in New Jersey, 1993-1994 (Launer 1993). This booklet, created by the New Jersey Association of Criminal Justice Educators (NJACJE), has a current listing of criminal justice programs and clearly identifies one-person programs in the Garden State

Methodology

Given, then, this lack of research about one-person programs in criminal justice, or any other discipline, it was up to the author to create a questionnaire to survey his New Jersey colleagues about this issue. Along with a cover letter, a twelve-question

survey document was developed (see Appendix) and distributed to the author's colleagues (most of whom are members of the NJACJE) identified through Launer's directory. It is appropriate at this time to discuss the number of one-person criminal justice programs in New Jersey. With one exception, all of the criminal justice programs staffed by only one full-time professor are located at two-year community colleges. New Jersey has a total of 21 counties, and 19 of them have their own community college with two of the counties sharing facilities with neighboring counties. One community college has no full-time criminal justice professor, but it manages to teach its students in night classes taught by adjuncts and day classes taught by full-time faculty at a neighboring four-year college. So of the 18 community colleges with full-time criminal justice faculty of their own, 11 of them (61%) were one-person programs in fall 1994. All were surveyed with only one program not responding (a 91% response rate).

In addition to completing the written questionnaire five of the ten respondents were interviewed over the telephone. These telephone interviews ranged from 15 minutes to one-half hour and were designed to elicit more in-depth comments and help flesh out the questionnaires. A written questionnaire was also completed by a professor at the only four-year college in New Jersey with a one-person criminal justice program. Were the various issues at the four-year college any different from those at the community colleges? Five surveys were also completed by the author's colleagues at his college. These professors were in one-person programs in theater, horticulture, computer science, legal assistant, and funeral service. Would the various issues

confronting one-person programs be any different for professors in other disciplines (aside from criminal justice)?

All colleagues (in whatever discipline or institution) were promised anonymity. Because of their candor on the questionnaires and during the telephone interviews their anonymity will be preserved to spare individuals possible embarrassment. Therefore, no quotations will be individually identified in this paper.

Before analyzing the completed questionnaires a brief comment is in order about some of the questions themselves. Questions #9, #10 and #11 (See Appendix) are the "heart" of the survey and were designed to discover the advantages, disadvantages and key issues confronting one-person programs. Question #8 tries to ascertain the extent to which part-time adjuncts are utilized in those types of programs. And question #7 is designed to clarify whether these so-called one-person programs are truly one-person programs. If some full-time faculty members from non-criminal justice disciplines (e.g., political science or sociology) teach criminal justice courses such as criminal law, the court system or criminology, should this still be defined as a one-person criminal justice program? If full-time faculty from other areas are teaching a substantial part of the criminal justice curriculum, then one could argue that it should no longer be considered a one-person program. This survey determined that this was essentially a "non-issue" in New Jersey. In only two of the 11 community colleges (designated as having one-person programs) were any other full-time faculty teaching criminal justice courses, and in both of them one professor taught only one criminal justice course each semester. Truly, 61% of the community colleges in New Jersey have one-person criminal justice programs.

## DISCUSSION

This section of the paper will summarize the primary responses to questions #9, #10 and #11 of the survey document. Little analysis of the issues will be made in this section. That will be dealt with in the concluding section of the paper.

### Advantages

Two of the ten respondents (one community college didn't respond) with one-person criminal justice programs felt that there were no advantages to this type of staffing arrangement. The "advantages" are not as numerous and pronounced as the "disadvantages" as far as the respondents were concerned. Most of the perceived advantages to this type of program center around several administrative issues.

Scheduling . The ease of scheduling criminal justice classes each semester was cited as a key benefit of the one-person program. All the respondents who answered question #9 positively mentioned they were permitted a fair amount of discretion in setting up their own teaching schedule and the discipline's schedule (whether on or off-campus) as well. This permitted the faculty to choose a class schedule that fit their personal needs. Also, with control over scheduling, the needs of adjuncts, students and the curriculum as a whole were able to be managed more easily.

Textbook Selection. Almost all respondents felt that choosing textbooks to use in various courses was a relatively painless process in one-person programs. Most colleges try to ensure that multiple sections of the same course are taught by professors using the same textbook(s) or reading list. Where this is the departmental practice, choosing textbooks for new courses or changing them for current courses can

become a real problem between colleagues. Obviously this whole process is simplified where there is only one full-time faculty member.

Curriculum Development . Many respondents mentioned that they had a good bit of leeway in shaping the criminal justice curriculum at their college. The professors felt they had the freedom to modify the curriculum, within reason, adding and deleting courses, changing course titles and descriptions, changing program requirements, etc. Two New Jersey community colleges just hired their first full-time criminal justice professors in the fall of 1994, and one of these new professors commented, "Since this is a new program I have the opportunity to develop it according to my sense as to what a two-year criminal justice program should be." Most criminal justice professors in one-person programs are not creating a curriculum from scratch, but they still enjoy the latitude to revise it as necessary.

Adjuncts. Even though many professors lamented the excessive use of part-time adjunct professors (which will be discussed later in the paper), they (the full-time professors) liked having the power to hire and supervise the adjuncts in the criminal justice program. At many schools this supervision of adjuncts even extends to formal classroom evaluations of their teaching competency. Particularly in one-person programs it is realized that the quality of adjunct professors has a substantial impact on the overall quality of the program. The full-time professors view this close control that they have over adjuncts as a real advantage to one-person programs.

Autonomy. The last major advantage to one-person criminal justice programs was cited by virtually all the survey respondents in one manner or another. That advantage could be called "autonomy." Many professors discussed it as "you are your

own boss," "less red tape," "short staff meetings" and so on. Even the four previous advantages have a common theme running through them: discretion and leeway to create, revise and get things done quickly in the criminal justice program. Many community colleges with one-person criminal justice programs give that person some far-reaching latitude to get the job done--the job of creating and/or maintaining a quality program with a healthy student enrollment. In essence, the one full-time professor becomes the college's in-house "expert" on all criminal justice-related matters. One professor said, "You are in charge and can be creative without worrying about stepping on other people's toes." One could argue that professors in general have a good deal of autonomy, but professors in one-person programs appear to have even greater levels of autonomy than most, and they clearly appreciate that.

Disadvantages

In contrast to the previous question concerning "advantages of one-person programs" (and two professors indicated that there were none), all the respondents listed a number of disadvantages to these types of programs. Not only were their negative comments more numerous, they were also much more strident.

Excessive Workload. Because there is no other full-time faculty member to share the workload with, it all falls on one person's shoulders; all respondents listed this is a drawback. All the administrative demands, program decisions, adjunct responsibilities and so on have to be done by the one criminal justice professor. A number of them complained that this excessive workload puts a lot of emotional strain on them as well as reducing the opportunities for faculty development (e.g., attending seminars and conferences) and interacting with the local criminal justice community.

Student Advisement. Related to the workload issue, is the student advisement load that many professors have to contend with. The sole criminal justice faculty member is often the only college advisor for all the criminal justice majors (whether full or part-time students). Most of the two and four-year criminal justice programs in New Jersey (as well as nationwide) are enjoying high student enrollments in their classes with numerous majors in their programs. While this bodes well for criminal justice higher education as a whole, it also means that professors are often overwhelmed by criminal justice majors for several weeks each semester during early registration as students sign up for the following semester's classes. Combining student advisement with the day-to-day contacts between faculty and students regarding issues such as career counseling, personal problems, all while acting as faculty advisor to the criminal justice club, it is understandable that faculty mention this as a negative factor.

Peer Interaction. Most survey respondents lamented the fact that there was no intellectual feedback and discussion with colleagues in their discipline. They feel isolated in these one-person programs, and, as one respondent said, "There is a lack of daily discussions with associates regarding current issues related to our discipline." And even though the one full-time professor has contact with the adjuncts in his/her program, once the semester starts that contact is usually peripheral at best. There is just no one to bounce ideas off of, not just related to criminal justice issues but also curriculum changes, course revisions and so on. One professor said that even arguments with colleagues were healthy and preferable to no response at all. In more human terms one respondent succinctly stated, "It's lonely sometimes."

Student Intellectual Stagnation. A number of professors feel that students who are not exposed to a variety of teachers and instructional methodologies are being intellectually short-changed. In many one-person criminal justice programs it is not unusual for the full-time faculty member to teach the "bread-and-butter" courses--the ones needed by majors to graduate. Often more than 50% of the curriculum's required courses are taught by the sole professor. For example, this may mean that if criminal justice majors are required to take six criminal justice courses for an associate degree, then three or four of them are taught by the same full-time professor. This is not intellectually healthy because as one professor commented, "Students are exposed to one predominant approach to the criminal justice community. Exposure to another point of view would be beneficial for a graduating student." Related to this is a lesser issue of professors who may become "too close" to their students because they encounter the same students in their classes semester after semester. This may lead to the student becoming "burnt-out" with the professor (and perhaps the discipline itself) and vice versa.

Sole Responsibility for Program. This is certainly related to several of the previous "negative points" that were discussed, but it was mentioned by several respondents as a separate problem in and of itself. As they see it, a significant drawback to one-person criminal justice programs is that there is no one else for the sole full-time professor to delegate authority to. Whether this person wants to be or not (or is administratively competent or not), he or she "is" the criminal justice program and has the responsibility to see that everything gets accomplished effectively. One professor said, "The buck starts and stops here," and another said, "One must assume

complete responsibility/accountability for the integrity of the program and each program course." One-person programs can present a daunting challenge to any professor, but this challenge can be particularly stressful for new and untenured faculty. One such professor (not in criminal justice) said that she "sometimes feels responsible for everything. If enrollment is down, it's my problem. If one of my adjuncts is no good, it's my problem."

Inadequate Reimbursement. Three respondents indicated that they were not reimbursed at all for their extra duties connected with acting as the administrative coordinator of their one-person criminal justice programs. One professor noted that his college had discontinued the role of program coordinator "but still expects the same coordination without compensation." Unfortunately, this questionnaire did not ask specifically about financial remuneration connected with one-person programs. In light of the increased workload for professors in these type of programs it is understandable that inadequate compensation will be viewed as a significant negative factor by faculty caught in such circumstances.

Key Issues

Concerning question #11 on the survey, the respondents were asked to identify and briefly discuss the key issues confronting one-person criminal justice programs. A number of their responses were simply a rehash of the disadvantages that they had discussed.

Wearing Too Many Hats. This important issue is clearly related to the excessive workload that many faculty members feel they have to bear. As one professor put it, "You're wearing too many hats and therefore you're spread too thin." Most criminal

justice faculty at community colleges teach five courses (15 credits) a semester as their normal load, and this may entail three, four or five separate class preparations. Some professors teach an overload course or two each semester as well. Added to all of the professor's teaching responsibilities are student advisement and counseling, administrative duties, institutional governance committees and so on. An additional facet to criminal justice programs is the desirability of maintaining ongoing contact with the various criminal justice agencies in a particular county. All of these responsibilities pile up on the sole professor who finds himself or herself in a one-person program. One respondent commented that this excessive workload factor could "lead to early career burnout."

Off-Campus Courses and Internships. Related to the workload question and how many "hats" one is wearing is the issue of off-campus courses and sites.' A number of community colleges offer criminal justice courses at one or more satellite sites throughout the local county. The single full-time professor may teach at these off-campus locations and/or supervise adjuncts who teach there. In addition, several respondents (who have students who take field internships) noted that student internships have to be developed and the students monitored at the site once they're placed. All of this takes travel time and adds to the professor's workload and responsibilities.

Peer Interaction. The single faculty member in a one-person program not only doesn't have any colleague to share the workload with, he or she doesn't have anyone to bounce ideas off of or engage in intellectual discussion on criminal justice matters. One respondent commented, "There is no one to share ideas with who is as intimately

involved with the program as I am. My advisory commission is a poor substitute for this missing input." The advisory commission that the respondent referred to is a fixture in most community college criminal justice programs nationwide. These advisory commissions or committees meet only once or twice during the academic year and are usually composed of seven to ten members who represent a cross-section of criminal justice agencies in the local area. While the advisory commission may provide some input and feedback to the lone criminal justice professor, it is really limited input at best.

Student Intellectual Stimulation. In another "key issue," (mentioned earlier as a "disadvantage") several professors noted the ongoing need to keep students intellectually stimulated, particularly in one-person programs where students may have the same professor for more than 50% of the required major courses. The respondents felt that professors have to avoid being narrow-minded in classroom discussions. An overly narrow perspective on criminal justice issues can, of course, stifle such discussions and also lead to students becoming intellectually stagnant, as they are only exposed to their professor's "correct" viewpoint. This is an issue that really confronts all professors to a degree, but it has to be especially guarded against by the single member of a one-person program.

Excessive Utilization of Adjuncts. Underlying most of the "disadvantages" and "key issues" mentioned by survey respondents is this one--the excessive use of adjuncts in one-person programs. While 50% of the curriculum's courses may be taught by the sole full-time faculty member, the other 50% are taught by part-time adjunct professors. One professor said that in his program there is "too much reliance on adjuncts." Another commented about the continuing concern regarding adjuncts

when he questioned the "quality of instruction and dedication to student needs by adjunct faculty." He also noted that there is a "lack of contact and discussion with them [adjuncts] regarding teaching philosophy, course content, text selection, grading criteria, etc." Another professor touched upon the "extremely limited training for adjuncts" and the additional work this places on the single faculty member who may have to hire, supervise and evaluate several adjuncts.

Question #8 on the survey specifically asked about the extent to which adjuncts are utilized in one-person community college criminal justice programs in New Jersey. The responses ranged from one college that uses one or two adjuncts who teach about 10% of the discipline's courses during the academic year to another college where ten adjuncts are utilized who teach 60% of the courses. A third community college noted that in some academic years as many as 75% of its criminal justice courses are taught by adjuncts. It appears that on average the typical one-person criminal justice program employs five adjuncts who teach about 40% or so of the discipline's courses offered each year.

Inadequate Reimbursement. To the professors of one-person programs who are getting no reimbursement or inadequate reimbursement for the increased responsibilities that are inherent in such programs, all other issues may well pale beside this one. Professors in such circumstances are quite vociferous about this, and one professor listed this as the only issue which was of paramount importance to him. Another said, "You are supposed to be everything to everybody for very little $." Professors in one-person programs who are disgruntled about their inadequate

reimbursement can obviously have a significant negative impact on the program as a whole.

## CONCLUSION

Many of the problems and issues connected with one-person criminal justice programs would be eliminated or substantially reduced by the employment of another full-time criminal justice professor. But many of the issues that were noted by respondents to the questionnaire are double-edged ones. For example, another full-time faculty member would help to reduce the administrative workload and provide for more comprehensive student advisement, but what would happen to the advantages of flexible program scheduling and autonomy in general? When another colleague is present, considerations such as textbook decisions and curriculum changes can become more complex and difficult to accomplish.

The economic reality of the times, though, will preclude most community colleges from hiring a second full-time faculty member to support criminal justice programs. "At many institutions, the use of part-time and temporary faculty has become a way of life. Budgets are balanced and classes assigned on the assumption that 20, 30 or 50 percent of all undergraduate sections will be taught by faculty members who are hired for a temporary assignment" (Gappa and Leslie 1993:2). So it is quite unrealistic to call for the elimination of part-time adjuncts from the criminal justice program. Even if adjuncts could somehow be eliminated from criminal justice programs, the question would then become whether they <u>should</u> be eliminated. Again, relating to the double-edged nature of many of these issues, "A degree program should always expose students to several perspectives regarding the processes of the criminal justice system.

If necessary, part-time instructors should be employed to accomplish such exposure" (Hoover and Lund 1977:15). Also adjuncts may have expertise in some areas (e.g., criminal law, corrections administration) that full-time faculty don't possess.

The real issue concerning adjuncts, then, is not whether they should be used but to what degree they should be used. The most important resource in higher education is full-time faculty. The Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences (1976:5) recognized this point in its accreditation guidelines, which required that the percentage of "annual credit hour production of criminal justice courses" taught by part-time faculty not exceed 50% in associate degree programs, 30% in baccalaureate programs, and 25% in graduate programs. The National Advisory Commission on Higher Education for Police Officers felt that "These standards, however, are insufficient to guarantee a high level of faculty involvement in the program. The part-time faculty should merely supplement, and not take the place of, the full-time faculty" (Sherman and NACHEPO 1978:113-114). Therefore, the Commission recommended that "In no case should part-time faculty be employed for more than 25 percent of a program's annual credit hour production" (6). This standard should apply in two-year as well as four-year colleges. The Commission felt that "An overreliance on part-time faculty produces inadequate faculty participation in institutional governance and advisement and counseling of students" (6).

The Joint Commission on Criminology and Criminal Justice Education and Standards echoed the call for criminal justice majors to "receive no more than 25 percent of their criminal justice course work from part-time instructors" (Ward and Webb 1984:18). The Joint Commission felt strongly that "the exploitation of part-time faculty is an embarrassment to the academic community. The part-time faculty's

commitments are minimal, because the commitments made to them are minimal. Moreover, the use of a large part-time faculty hurts an individual criminal justice program and hinders the national growth of the field. The institution, the field, and the students benefit only when the use of part-time faculty is carefully limited" (Ward and Webb 1984:152). One-person criminal justice programs that have adjuncts teaching 40% or 50% or more of the discipline's annual course offerings are clearly overstaffed with part-timers. College administrators at these colleges should keep the use of part-time faculty to a minimum, and they should seriously consider hiring a second full-time faculty person. And the decision to use adjuncts should "be based on an academic rather than a cost-effective rationale" (Ward and Webb 1984:16).

In addition to the interrelated issues of adjunct professors and excessive workload several other items should be addressed in the concluding section of this exploratory study. One of these issues, "peer interaction," would become a "non-issue" if a second full-time professor were hired. But given that most one-person criminal justice programs will remain that way (at least in the immediate future), what can be done to alleviate such a solitary state of affairs? One popular current buzzword, "networking," will address that issue to some degree. It is especially important for faculty who find themselves in one-person criminal justice programs to network. They should network with criminal justice colleagues at other two and four-year colleges within their state or region. Initial contacts can be established through state and/or regional associations (offshoots of the ACJS) and will enable lone criminal justice professors to meet and interact with peers in their discipline. Aside from interacting with peers in one's own discipline who are teaching at another school, it is also important to

interact and network with professors in other criminal justice-related disciplines within one's own college. Fellow professors at one's own school can provide some intellectual stimulation and feedback on criminal justice matters. Professors in the social sciences and humanities (e.g., history, political science, sociology, psychology) should be fairly conversant with key criminal justice issues. They should also be aware of college politics as well as the administrative "goings-on" at a particular school. Interaction with individual members of the criminal justice advisory committee (previously discussed) as well as criminal justice professionals in the local community can provide intellectual stimulation for the lone professor also.

Just as a number of respondents are concerned about their own lack of intellectual stimulation as they find themselves in one-person programs, so too are they concerned about the lack of student intellectual stimulation because of the student having much of his or her course work taught by the same professor. Professors working in any size program (whether staffed by one or ten professors) have to always guard against pontificating in class and advocating only one "correct" point of view (the professor's) on controversial issues. This is particularly true in one-person programs. This is also a reason why some authoritative sources cite a <u>need</u> for part-time adjuncts because they can bring a fresh point of view into the classroom. To stimulate the student's intellectual growth and prevent student burnout (because of having the same professor course after course), the Joint Commission on Criminology and Criminal Justice Education and Standards called for "no more than one-third of the total credit hours in criminal justice being offered by the same instructor" (Ward and Webb 1984:18).

The issue of reimbursement can become an all-consuming one to faculty who feel that they are inadequately compensated because of the additional workload that confront them as the sole faculty member in a one-person criminal justice program. Often there are numerous activities assigned to them, ranging from marketing and student advisement to being advisor to the student club and talking with community groups about criminal justice issues. A whole host of responsibilities is placed solely on one person's shoulders, and his or her college should recognize this through adequate compensation. If the lone professor is acting as both teacher and program coordinator, it is absolutely imperative that he or she be adequately reimbursed for fulfilling that dual role.

The reader may have correctly surmised by now that the same basic "advantages," "disadvantages" and "key issues" that confront one-person criminal justice programs in community colleges also confront sole faculty members in any discipline at either the two or four-year college. As was noted earlier in the paper, one questionnaire was completed by a professor in a one-person criminal justice program at a four-year college and five were completed by community college professors from other disciplines. Most of the issues and comments from these respondents were interchangeable with the single criminal justice professors at the community college-level.

This is an exploratory study and as is the case with any preliminary inquiry, further research is needed. This research could well be directed at more definitively identifying the problems and issues that confront one-person criminal justice programs. It also could be directed at the author's hypothesis that the issues that confront one-

person programs are essentially the same in all disciplines and in two-year and four-year colleges as well. As long as there are one-person programs, some unique issues will confront them. But, as is often the case, being "forewarned is forearmed." If both professors who staff such programs and college administrators who use them are aware of the key issues and possible drawbacks to them, then preventative and/or corrective steps can be undertaken. The issues challenging one-person programs are not insurmountable provided that they are addressed in a timely manner

## REFERENCES

Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences [ACJS] Accreditation and Standards Committee (1976) Accreditation Guidelines for Postsecondary Criminal Justice Education Programs (rev. ed. 1979). Normal, IL: ACJS (brochure).

Carter, David L., Allen D. Sapp, and Darrel W. Stephens (1989) The State of Police Education: Policy Direction for the 21st Century. Washington, DC: Police Executive Research Forum.

Gappa, Judith M. and David W. Leslie (1993) The Invisible Faculty. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hoover, Larry T. and Dennis W. Lund (1977) Guidelines for Criminal Justice Programs in Community and Junior Colleges. Washington, DC: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

Launer, Harold M., ed. (1993) Directory of Criminal Justice Programs in New Jersey, 1993-1994. Trenton, NJ: New Jersey Association of Criminal Justice Educators.

Nemeth, Charles P. (1991) Anderson's Directory of Criminal Justice Education - 1991. Cincinnati: Anderson.

Pearson, Richard et al. (1980) Criminal Justice Education: The End of the Beginning. New York: John Jay.

Sherman, Lawrence W. and the National Advisory Commission on Higher Education for Police Officers (1978) The Quality of Police Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass and the Police Foundation.

Ward, Richard H. and Vincent J. Webb (1984) Quest for Quality. New York: University Publications and the Joint Commission on Criminology and Criminal Justice Education and Standards.

## APPENDIX: QUESTIONNAIRE

### One-Person Criminal Justice Programs

1. Name of College _____
   _____
2. Your Name _____
   _____
3. Academic Rank and Highest Degree Earned _____
   _____
4. Total number of years teaching _____
   _____
5. Coordinator of which academic program(s)? _____
   _____
6. How many courses do you teach during the academic year?
   Normal Load _____ Overload _____
7. A. Are there any other full-time faculty members that teach courses in your discipline? _____
   _____

   B. If there are, how many full-time professors teach courses in your discipline during the academic year? _____
   _____

   C. In total, approximately what percentage of your discipline's courses do they teach during the academic year? _____
   _____
8. A. How many adjunct (part-time) instructors teach courses in your discipline during the academic year? _____
   _____ _____

   B. In total, approximately what percentage of your discipline's courses do they teach during the academic year? _____
   _____

9. Are there any advantages to being the primary full-time professor in your program? _____
If yes, please briefly list them._____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

10. Are there any disadvantages to being the primary full-time professor in your program? _____
If yes, please briefly list them._____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

11. What are the key issues confronting a professor who is the primary full-time faculty member in his/her program? Please list and briefly discuss.
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

12. Would you be agreeable to discussing this subject further with me? _____

If yes, please list your telephone numbers.
DAY (_____)_____
EVENING (_____)_____

Thanks very much for your time and assistance!

*Please return this questionnaire as soon as possible in the stamped, self-addressed envelope. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Professor Peter Horne, Ph.D., at (609) 586-4800, ext. 315 or (609) 443-8696.